

10/5/69

Miss Katherine Kinsella
American Program Bureau
59 Temple Place
Boston, Mass. 02111

Dear Miss Kinsella,

By the time you take your share of a \$500 honorarium and I pay taxes, travel and other costs, for fully half of the country speaking for this sum will yield a net loss. What I actually said is that I would speak for this honorarium in the eastern part of the country, but not in the west unless multiple arrangements would be possible.

I had thought this out before going to Boston. I've waited a day before answering your letter of the second to see if I can reach a different conclusion. It just is not possible. I will regret it if this means you can book no engagements, but I do not look forward to speaking at a net loss.

The problem is not, from my experience, the amount of the honorarium. It is the conjecture and irresponsibility to which too many audiences have been subjected as a substitute for fact and solid information.

I would suggest it may be advisable if you can book a few engagements so you and I can both get an evaluation of audience reactions to what I would say. When there is a favorable reaction, the word seems to get around. The size of the honorarium is not excessive. That is not, in my belief, the real problem.

I am disturbed at your reference to "our exclusive arrangement with Mark Lane". That preceded the invitation for me to go to Boston. It existed as much then as it does now. And how does it jibe with your offering of Clay Shaw? Lane is an effective speaker. I would certainly expect you to honor your obligations to him as I would to me. If this is the case, you are in the position of offering only ancient history, for he has done no original work in more than three years. As a matter of fact, the most effective material he has been using lately is mine, not his. One of those things that has diminished program interest in the subject is the endless rehashing of what everyone has heard, what is not new when it is factual.

Aside from the King/Ray case, there may be other, if limited opportunities. I have written two of three projected books on the President's autopsy and what relates and have the third researched. I should be able to stimulate medical and legal audiences with entirely new material. This material and a study I have made of the top-secret inner workings of the Commission itself, from which the staff was barred, should also have much appeal to those interested in the functioning of government, particularly in colleges.

Thank you for your candor. I now understand the delay in responding to my earlier letters. However, if you still want me to prepare a brochure, whether

or not the expense of printing it now seems warranted, I would appreciate an answer to the questions about it.

I would like to ask you this question: are you saying black institutions and black audiences have no interest in the Martin Luther King assassination? If there is another single person who has made the study requisite to making a responsible speech on it, it is unknown to me.

My experience with colleges is largely through the audiences. However, in many California universities, from my experiences, a presentation of the King/Ray case should be welcome, particularly at Berkeley, San Francisco State and UCLA. No less would this be true of the University of Wisconsin (Madison). A single California appearance would cost me more in transportation than I would net, so I cite this merely as illustration.

There is one thing else I am trying to say. I would not have one set speech, repeated with slight variations for all audiences. The depth and breadth of my own, original work is such there is a wide variety of specialized audiences to which I could present what is angled to their interests.

Have you any further thoughts or questions?

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg